

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified Application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 11-20 are pending in the Application, claim 10 having been canceled herein and claims 8 and 9 having been previously canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Makashima (U.S. Patent No. 4,639,329). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate claim 10 and have canceled claim 10. Both the transmitting and reflecting surfaces of the optical element recited in claim 1 have optical powers. Thus, the optical element of claim 1 has image-formation capability. In addition, the reflecting surface is designed to bend light rays in the optical element.

Makashima neither teaches nor suggests such features. At column 1, lines 13-21, Makishima discloses various parts, but does not show any optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power. In addition, Makishima does not teach or suggest that the “organic-inorganic composite material” is used for any optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power. There is no suggestion in Makashima to make an optical element having the features recited in claim 1. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 11-20 are in condition for allowance and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7 and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Hamblen et al. (U.S. 5,143,659). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

At column 1, lines 37-39, Hamblen (U.S. Patent No. 5,143,659) discloses that a microlens is fabricated of the “organic/inorganic composite substance”, but does not show an “optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power”. In addition, Hamblen et al. do not teach or suggest that the “organic-inorganic composite material” is used for any “optical element that at least

comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power.” Thus, there is no suggestion in Hamblen to make an optical element as recited in claim 1.

In addition, column 2, line 30 to column 3, line 11 of Gillberg-LaForce et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,913,845) discloses a process of fabricating “nonlinear optical medium, transparent solid medium, transparent thin film, optical light switch or light modulator device”, but do not disclose or suggest an “optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power.” Gillberg-LaForce et al. do not teach or suggest that the “organic-inorganic composite material” is used for an “optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power.” Thus, there is no reason to believe one of ordinary skill in the art would modify the teachings of Gillberg-LaForce et al. to make an optical element as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 7, and 11-16 are in condition for allowance and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10-13 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Arakawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,098); rejected claims 1-7 and 10-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Koyama et al. (U.S. 6,590,722); and rejected claims 1-7 and 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Arakawa et al., in view of Koyama et al., or Yoshimura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,534,589) or Imanishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,124,964). Applicants respectfully traverse all of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Arakawa et al. do not teach or suggest an “optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power”. Nor do Arakawa et al. teach or suggest that the “organic-inorganic composite material” as applied to an “optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power.” See, e.g., column 13, lines 6-12 of Arakawa et al. where various uses are listed, but none disclose or suggest an optical element as recited in claim 1.

Koyama does not disclose or suggest an “optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power.” Nor does Koyama teach or suggest that the “composite organic and inorganic component” applies to


an “optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power.” At column 3, lines 12-14, Koyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,590,722) merely discloses a “prism or beam splitter” obtained by making an “organic component and inorganic component” composite.

Neither Yoshimura et al. (U.S. Patent No. ,534,589) nor Imanishi (U.S. Patent No. 6,124,964) discloses or suggest an “optical element that at least comprises two transmitting surfaces and one reflecting surface, wherein each surface has optical power”. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over Arakawa et al., Koyama et al., Yoshimura et al., and Imanishi et al., whether considered alone or in combination and thus request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicants have addressed all of the Examiner’s objections and rejections and respectfully submit that the Application is now in condition for allowance.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP


HENRY J. DALEY
Reg. No. 42459
Tel. No. (202) 775-9832
Fax No. 703 905-2500

Date: July 7, 2004
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000